

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 30, 2010. Claims 33-38 are presented for examination, of which Claims 33, 37 and 38 are in independent form. All the claims presented for examination have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his supervisor for conducting a telephonic interview with two of his representatives on November 1, 2010. During that interview, the claims of the present invention and the prior art were reviewed. The Examiners and Applicant's representatives discussed the claims, particularly Claim 33, in relation to the cited references. The claims have been amended partly based on that discussion, in an effort to clarify their language. The points on which Applicant believes that the claims are distinguished over the prior art are set out below.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claim to eliminate this as an issue. It is believed that the above-mentioned rejection has been obviated and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

In addition, Claims 33-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,361,332 (Yoshida et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,148,346 (Hanson) and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0002063 (Oomura et al.).

Applicant submits that the independent claims, together with their dependent claims, are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The general nature of the present invention has been adequately discussed in previous amendments, as have the claims, and it is not believed necessary to repeat that discussion in full.

Claim 33, as clarified, recites, among other features, “a display unit configured to display the list of code systems obtained by said obtainment unit *in response to* a determination by said determination unit that the code system of the font designated by said designation unit is not included in the list of code systems (emphasis added)”.

In other words, the claim is directed to 1) displaying to a user a list of 2) code systems supported by a printer under consideration, *as a result of* 3) a determination that a code system previously designated by the user is not on the list. This feature is not believed to be disclosed or suggested in *Yoshida*, *Hanson* and *Oomura*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

As discussed in the telephone interview, *Yoshida* and *Hanson* are understood to deal with fonts in general, with an occasional emphasis on glyph sets but without ever discussing code systems in particular. Even assuming that they did specifically discuss code systems, Applicant submits that these references could not be permissibly combined, nor would they combine to teach the display unit.

As Applicant understands, the Examiner believes that because *Hanson* is deemed to teach 1) and possibly 3) as well, *Oomura* is deemed to teach 2) and *Yoshida* is deemed to teach 3), the references could be validly combined to satisfy the cause-and-effect relationship in the display unit.

The Office Action states that the display of a list of fonts supported by a printer in *Hanson* takes place after a determination by a user that a particular font is not supported by a printer. However, Applicant cannot find any support in *Hanson* for such

assertion. Instead, Applicant finds it at least conceivable in *Hanson* that a user would need to rely on the display of a list of fonts supported by the printer to determine whether a particular font is supported by the printer, before deciding to install that particular font (*see* col. 6, lines 30-45). *Yoshida* does not remedy this deficiency because it is not believed to address any further interaction with a user, such as the display of a list of code systems to the user, after the initial designation of a particular font by the user (*see* col. 23, lines 4-9). Therefore, even assuming that *Yoshida* and *Hanson* did specifically discuss code systems, Applicant does not see any reason why anyone with ordinary skill in the art would want to combine them, or how any combination would satisfy the causal relationship of the display unit as recited in Claim 33.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons noted above, Claim 33 is believed patentable over *Yoshida*, *Hanson* and *Oomura*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 37 and 38 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and, therefore, are also believed to be patentable over *Yoshida*, *Hanson* and *Oomura* for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims. Therefore, the independent claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of

the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200